REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

I.   Status of Claims

Claims 1-28 are currently pending in this application. This Amendment amends claims 1, 9, 14, 15, 23, and 28 and addresses each point of rejection raised by the Examiner. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicants note with appreciation that the Examiner indicated that claims 6, 13, 20, and 27 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

II.   Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 14 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Campbell et al ("Campbell"), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0208601. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

"[A]n invention is anticipated if the same device, including all the claim limitations, is shown in a single prior art reference. Every element of the claimed invention must be literally present, arranged as in the claim. The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the patent claim." MPEP § 2131.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections because Campbell does not disclose, suggest, or anticipate each and every feature of the amended claims. In particular, starting with independent claim 14, the amended claim now recites:

A method of providing multiple services according to a plurality of service types in a data only mobile telecommunication system having an access network (AN) for communicating with an access terminal (AT) on a radio channel and a packet data service node (PDSN) for providing a data service to the AT via the AN, the method comprising the steps of:

transmitting stream type data between the AT and the PDSN in traffic paths established for a plurality of service instances set to a plurality of service types, which are distinguished by different stream headers, by a connection for the data service;

transmitting from the AT to the PDSN via the AN a connection close message with the service type of a service instance to be terminated, upon request for termination of the service instance; and

terminating the service instance in the AT upon receipt of a connection close response message from the PDSN via the AN.

Applicants respectfully submit that, at the least, Campbell fails to anticipate transmitting *stream type* data "in traffic paths established for a plurality of service instances set to a plurality of service types, *which are distinguished by different stream headers*, by a connection for the data service".

Campbell merely discloses reducing the waste of airlink bandwidth by intercepting a first communication session and switching the data flow of the second communication session to an existing air interface channel associated with the first communication session or by terminating the data flow on an existing communication channel associated with the first communication session and employing the communication channel associated with the second session (*see* paragraph [0012], Campbell).

In Campbell, the signaling message indicating a new incoming communication session includes information regarding the type of data associated with second

-11-

communication session and is merely used for notifying a user about the data type associated with the second communication session (*see* paragraph [0036], Campbell).

This is different from the presently recited claim features wherein *stream type* data is transmitted in traffic paths <u>already established</u> for a plurality of service instances set to a plurality of service types, *which are distinguished by different stream headers*, by a connection for the data service.

Applicants respectfully submit that Campbell is silent regarding the amended claim feature of a *stream type* data, which are defined to distinguish various service types. Moreover, Campbell is also silent regarding the amended claim feature of a *stream header*, which is used to distinguish the plurality of service types.

Therefore, Campbell does not disclose, teach, or suggest the presently recited claim features wherein *stream type* data is transmitted in traffic paths <u>already established</u> for a plurality of service instances set to a plurality of service types, *which are distinguished by different stream headers*, by a connection for the data service.

Claim 28 comprises similar subject matter to that of claim 14 and is therefore distinguished from Campbell for reasons similar to those given above with respect to claim 14. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 14 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

III.   Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-19, 21-26 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campbell, in view of Kohli et al. ("Kohli"), U.S. Patent

Application Publication No. 2004/0240427. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Regarding independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that, at the least, Campbell, in view of Kohli, fails to render obvious the amended claim language of "configuring a session for *defining stream types* and setting *different stream headers to distinguish* the plurality of service types having different traffic characteristics by the connection".

The Examiner admits that Campbell does not teach configuring a session for setting the plurality of service types having different traffic characteristics by the connection. The Examiner alleges that Kohli cures the deficiencies of Campbell.

Applicants respectfully submit that Kohli does not disclose, teach, suggest, or render obvious the amended claim 1 features of defining *stream types* and setting *different stream headers to distinguish* the plurality of service types having different traffic characteristics by the connection. Both Campbell and Kohli are silent regarding these exemplary embodiments of the present invention.

Claims 9, 15, and 23 comprise similar subject matter to that of claim 1 and is therefore distinguished from Campbell, in view of Kohl, for reasons similar to those given above with respect to claim 1. Dependent claims 2-8, 10-13, 16-22, and 24-27 are distinguished from Campbell and Kohl at least for the reasons given above by virtue of their dependence on their respective base claims.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-19, 21-26 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

-13-

IV.   Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 6, 13, 20, and 27 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 6, 13, 20, and 27 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form, but respectfully submit that a broader scope of the invention is patentable in view of the art of record. Applicants respectfully request that the rewriting of claims 6, 13, 20, and 27 be held in abeyance until the Examiner has had the opportunity to reconsider the allowability of the respective parent claims.

V.   **Conclusion**

In view of the above, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance and notice to this effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Paul H. Nguyen-Ba
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 60,742

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.
1300 19th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 659-9076

Dated: September 6, 2007